

### REMARKS

Claims 3-7, 9 and 10 are pending in the application.

Claims 3-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected.

Independent claims 12-15 have been newly added. These claims will substitute for independent claims 3, 7, 9 and 10, which have been cancelled. The new claims are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matter is entered.

Claims 4-6 have been amended for clarity and now depend from claim 12.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Keesman (USP 5,729,293) in view of Wee et al. (USP 6,697,061, hereinafter Wee). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

#### Claim 12

Claim 12 recites: "decoding said encoded data signal to obtain a decoded data signal in a frequency domain;

inserting, in the frequency domain, an additional data signal into the decoded data signal;" (emphasis added).

Claim 12 describes inserting an additional data signal in the frequency domain. It is admitted in the Office Action that Keesman fails to describe or suggest inserting additional data. The Office Action alleges Wee describes inserting additional data. However, in complete contrast to claim 12, Wee describes adding the additional data in the spatial domain. There is no suggestion of inserting, in the frequency domain, an additional data signal into the decoded data signal, as recited in claim 12.

Since it is admitted that Keesman fails to suggest such a feature and Wee teaches inserting a signal in the spatial domain, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the recited features recited in claim 12. Thus the rejection should no be applied to new claim 12.

#### Claim 4

Dependent claim 4 recites: "subtracting a residual signal from said motion-compensated signal, wherein said residual signal resulting from the difference between said additional data signal and its predicted version" (emphasis added).

The Office Action points to the combination of Keesman and Wee, however, nowhere are the above features even suggested by the combination. The Office Action

points to col. 7, lines 60-67 of Wee as allegedly showing the features of claim 4. However, in this section of Wee the discussion refers to the re-compression of the signal. Wee is not discussing the additional data signal and specifically does not teach a residual signal resulting from the difference between said additional data signal and its predicted version.

Thus, the rejection of claim 4 cannot be sustained as the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the recited features in this dependent claim.

#### Claims 5 and 6

Dependent claims 5 and 6, similarly to claim 4, recite additional features which the Office Action points to Wee as allegedly showing. For example, the Office Action points to Wee's quote of: "wherein the logo is added at step 108."

However, clearly Wee does not even remotely suggest the features of inserting the additional data as recited in each of these dependent claims. In fact, Wee teaches adding the data to a fully decoded signal. Wee is completely silent concerning the features recited in claims 5 and 6 and in fact teaches something completely different.

Thus, the rejection of claims 5 and 6 cannot be sustained as the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all the recited features in each dependent claim. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### Claims 13-15

The analysis of independent claims 13-15 is substantially analogous to the analysis of claim 12, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claims 13-15 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that they are patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 12. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection should not be applied to claims 13-15 and the claims should be allowed.

#### Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues. In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please

charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For Larry Liberchuk,  
Registration No. 40,352

Date: October 25, 2007

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914)333-9602  
Fax: (914)332-0615